

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 1-22 have previously been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §103, and Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 3 and 17 were objected to, and no claims were allowed.

By this Supplemental Amendment and Reply, Claims 1-8, 16-18 and 22 are amended, and no claims are cancelled or added. Accordingly, Claims 1-22 remain pending for further examination. Entry of the above-described amendment and favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is requested.

**Interview:**

Firstly, Applicants and Applicants' representative thank Examiner Vei Chung Liang and Supervisory Primary Examiner Kuen S. Lu for the courtesy of an in-person interview conducted on November 13, 2008. As noted in Examiner Liang's Interview Summary having a mailing date of November 17, 2008, the discussions during the interview included an overview of aspects of the invention and proposed limitations to the claims that Applicants assert even further distinguish the subject matter of the present invention from the prior art of record. As noted at the conclusion of the interview, this Supplemental Amendment and Reply is submitted to formalize claim limitations discussed during the interview.

Additionally, and appended to this Supplemental Amendment and Reply, Applicants respectfully submit an Affidavit of Michael R. Song, filed under 37 C.F.R. 1.132, to enter into the record of the instant application evidence of commercial success directly derived from the claimed invention. The Affidavit is discussed in more detail below.

**Claim Amendments:**

As noted above, Claims 1-8, 16-18 and 22 are amended. Support for the amendments to independent Claims 1, 16 and 22 may be found in the original disclosure and at least at paragraph [0028] and FIG. 6 of the Specification as filed (e.g., paragraph [0052] of the Specification as published). Additionally, independent Claims 1, 16 and 22 as well as dependent Claims 2-8 were amended to highlight the names of the novel and non-obvious subsets for storing KIDS in view of a suggestion of the Examiners. Support for such amendments to Claims

1-8, 16 and 22 may be found in the original disclosure and at least at Claims 1-8 as originally filed, paragraphs [0022] and [0023] of the Specification as filed (e.g., paragraphs [0042] and [0043] of the Specification as published), and FIGS. 4, 5A and 5B. Claims 17 and 18 are also amended to clarify novel and non-obvious rules employed by the inventive storage management system. Support for the amendments to Claims 17 and 18 may be found in the original disclosure and at least at a section of the Specification entitled “Rules of Operation” extending from paragraph [0033] to paragraph [0048] of the Specification as filed (e.g., paragraphs [0070] to [0085] of the Specification as published). Specifically, and for the convenience of the Examiner, each recited limitation of Claim 18 is cross-referenced to Applicants’ “Rule” numbering system in the Specification as filed and as published in the chart below. The limitation of Claim 17 as now presented is reflected within Applicants’ Rule 3, described below.

<b>Claim limitation</b>	<b>Rule Number</b>	<b>Paragraph of Spec as Filed</b>	<b>Paragraph of Spec as Published</b>
eliminating software application default storage locations such that electronic ...	Rule 1	[0034]	[0071]
implementing one storage system spanning electronic and physical ...	Rule 2	[0035]	[0072]
using said priority based scheme of said plurality of logical partitions to break...	Rule 3	[0036]	[0073]
using a general subset for storing KID that properly references ...	Rule 4	[0037]	[0074]
labeling all KID so as to include at least a date and a title thereof;	Rule 5	[0038]	[0075]
employing a numerical indication of priority within a subset label for ...	Rule 6	[0039]	[0076]
maximizing availability of icons representing subsets of said logical ...	Rule 7	[0040]	[0077]
when options for searching one subset of said plurality of logical partitions ...	Rule 8	[0041]	[0078]

arranging physical storage locations to reflect said priority based scheme ...	Rule 13	[0046]	[0083]
establishing guidelines for duration of KID storage in electronic and ...	Rule 14	[0047]	[0084]
naming subset KID storage categories to describe content and context ...	Rule 15	[0048]	[0085]

As noted by Applicants during the interview, it is respectfully submitted that the amendments to Claim 18 address the Examiner's objection of Claim 18, as previously filed, under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Novelty and Non-Obviousness of Claims:

As noted by Applicants during the interview, the present invention, recited in the instant claims, includes a system for storing knowledge, information and data (KID) having, *inter alia*:

1. an interface providing a plurality of logical partitions for segregating and storing KID in a priority-based and standardized scheme;

2. the priority-based and standardized scheme reflects personal and professional core values of a free enterprise economic system and, thus, is universal (as described in paragraph 25 of the Specification as originally filed) having applicability in more than one industry;

3. the priority-based and standardized includes personal levels that segregate KID storage into a TEAMS OF PEOPLE subset, an ACTIVITIES subset and an ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION subset, as well as professional levels that segregate KID storage into a CLIENTS subset, an OUTPUT subset, a TEAMS subset and an ADMINISTRATION subset;

4. the priority-based and standardized further includes a clustering of KID to promote transferability between receivers (as described in paragraph 26 of the Specification as originally filed), extensibility across data store platforms (as described in paragraph 27 of the Specification as originally filed) and scalability in understanding of the KID by providing a plurality of professional scheme models at an enterprise view, a business unit view, a division view, departmental view, team view and an individual view (as described in paragraph 28 of the Specification as originally filed); and

5. the interface further providing rules and tools for configuring a data store and for storing and accessing KID included therein.

As previously noted by Applicants, the present invention's universal, transferable, extensible and scalable approach to segregating and storing knowledge, information and data (KID) in a data store as recited in, for example, independent Claims 1, 16 and 22, as now written, is not seen to be described or suggested by the prior art of record.

In view thereof, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103, at least since the claims as now written are clearly patentable over the prior art of record cited alone and in proposed combinations.

Additional Documents:

Appended to this Supplemental Amendment and Reply is an **Affidavit of Michael R. Song Filed under 37 CFR 1.132**. As noted above, the Affidavit is submitted to make of record evidence to traverse a rejection of the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. §103. In particular, the Affidavit presents evidence of secondary consideration including commercial success of the claimed invention, and the long felt need for such a system and evidence that experts in the industry doubt that such a system could be provided (e.g., failures of others).

Applicants believe that the foregoing amendments and remarks are fully responsive to prior Office Actions of record, and that the claims are allowable over the references applied by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the present application, remove the outstanding rejections, and allow the application to issue.

Applicants have made a diligent and sincere effort to place this application in condition for immediate allowance and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. To expedite prosecution of this application to allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney to discuss any issues relating to this application.

No fee is believed due with the filing of this Supplemental Amendment and Reply. However, if an additional fee is due, Applicants authorize the payment of any additional charges that may be necessary to maintain the pendency of the present application to the undersigned attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-3342.

Respectfully submitted,  
Michaud-Duffy Group, LLP



Michael K. Kinney, Reg. No. 42,740  
Attorney for Applicants  
Email: [kinney@michaud-duffy.com](mailto:kinney@michaud-duffy.com)

DATE: December 10, 2008

Michaud-Duffy Group LLP  
CenterPoint  
306 Industrial Park Road  
Suite 206  
Middletown, CT 06457-1532  
Tel. No.: (860) 632-7200  
Fax No.: (860) 632-8269